

From: LWillo1124@aol.com [mailto:LWillo1124@aol.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 11:13 AM

To: yscuba@californiadivers.com

Cc: SusanatPGLaw@aol.com; daniel.davis@earthlink.net; pearse@biology.ucsc.edu; PReilly@dfg.ca.gov; ibmiller@comcast.net; dan@cortco.com; lisaben@redshift.com; rre@redshift.com; Melissa Miller-Henson; exec@seaotters.org; manager@ci.pg.ca.us; cdocean@earthlink.net; LWillo1124@aol.com

Subject: Re: Pacific Grove Marine Gardens Fish Refuge

Dear Jesus Ruiz:

We very much appreciate your information that you have been sending us, and the good work you have done on the MLPA CCRSG. As you know, we are greatly offended by the fact, and this is our opinion, that probably Joseph Milton, David Bunn, Paul Reilly, Phil Isenberg, and DFG Director Ryan Broddrick have, by design, caused the Tidepool Coalition to be omitted as a stakeholder on the MLPA CCRSG.

We will certainly continue to pursue with our representatives in Sacramento why a local marine organization representing the concerns of the public and people of Pacific Grove, who want a "NO TAKE" Reserve, (we have the petitions with 5000 signatures to prove this) has been excluded from the central coast process. The explanation given to me by BRTF Chairman, Phil Isenberg, at the last Monterey meeting during public comment 'just doesn't fly with us.'

Yes, we are working on making some changes that you suggested in your e-mail of 1/17/06, and I will tell you that we have something planned that will be forthcoming in the next few days, and hope we will have your support.

Now, there is something I must ask you because you have not made it crystal clear to the Coalition where you stand, and what your position is in keeping a portion of the P.G. Marine Gardens Fish Refuge as the DFG now calls it, a State Marine Conservation Area, a term the California DFG did not even have the courtesy to notify the owners of this refuge, (The City) that they were changing the name to their own liking. I want to know exactly where you stand about keeping the integrity, the name and its purpose of a "No Take" area and as a State Marine Reserve in its entirety.

We do not want spearfishing in our refuge, kelp harvesting, commercial fishing, or collecting invertebrates in our refuge for public displays by the aquaria industry, or shipping or bartering of our marine animals to other destinations. As I have stated many times before, the Tidepool Coalition has no opposition to the aquarium industry, with the exception of its local collecting practices.

I want to draw an analogy. I am, in no way, comparing the Coalition's efforts with those of Abraham Lincoln, but I have been a student of the Civil War for sometime. Lee and I have toured most of the battlefields of that great war. I can only say that I have the same convictions and the same reasons for not compromising our Refuge as Lincoln did in 1861 about not breaking up the Union of the United States, nor am I trying to grandstand.

Splitting up or piecemealing our refuge with State Marine Reserves at both ends, and a State Marine Conservation Area in the middle, with bits and pieces of conservation intermingled with commercialism is a system that in my mind can never be effectively enforced or effectively made workable. And it is not what the public expects in the way of real substantive conservation in this new millennium when "Our Oceans Are in Crisis"

Jim Willoughby, Chairman
Tidepool Coalition

cc: Susan Goldbeck, Coalition Attorney
Dan Davis, MLPA CCRSG (alternate)
John Pearce
Paul Reilly
P.G. City Council and City Manager
DeAnne Albers, Friends of the Sea Otter
Melissa for MLPA Comments